

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/734,532 | | SAILER ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | DAVID E. ENGLAND | 2443 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID E. ENGLAND. (3)_____.

(2) James J. Bitetto. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Deverill and Snapp.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David E. England/
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney contacted the Examiner to discuss the claim language of claim 12. Attorney stated that Deverill and Snapp didn't teach marking the earlier measurement as changed as stated in the claim. After careful examination of the prior art it is clear that Snapp teaches over writing the old value and that is not the same as marking the earlier measurement as changed. Attorney also stated that the prior art didn't teach the aggregating and aggregated value. Examiner stated that Deverill clearly teaches this limitation since aggregating, as broadly interpreted by the Examiner, could mean to just put together, much like a packet. Examiner will update search for the claim limitation not taught by the cited prior art.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/734,532 First Named Applicant: REINER SAILER
Examiner: DAVID E. ENGLAND Art Unit: 2443 Status of Application: _____

Tentative Participants:

(1) Richard S. Yapchanyk (2) David E. England
(3) James J. Bitetto (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 1/27/09 or 2/4/09 3/3/09 Proposed Time: 3:00 PM 10:00 AM

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

| Issues (Rej., Obj., etc) | Claims/ Fig. #s | Prior Art | Discussed | Agreed | Not Agreed |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) <u>103(a) Rej.</u> | <u>claim 12</u> | <u>Refs. A, B</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (2) _____ | _____ | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) _____ | _____ | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (4) _____ | _____ | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

Refs. A and B are directed to completely different subject matters than the present invention, and thus, do not teach

"A method for providing attestation in a server execution environment," as recited in claim 12. Further, Ref. A fails to teach " that measurements [which] are taken... result in a unique fingerprint for each respective selected part."

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

JAMES J. BITETTO

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

40,513

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature